



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ALLENTIACAN, BOROROAN, AND CALCHAQUIAN LINGUISTIC STOCKS OF SOUTH AMERICA

BY ALEXANDER F. CHAMBERLAIN

I. ALLENTIACAN

AT the time of the Spanish conquest, the *Allentiacs*, or Huarpes (Guarpes), inhabited the plains about the great lagoons of Huanacache, extending probably to the western slopes of the Sierra de Córdoba and southward to the northern parts of San Luis and Mendoza. According to Boman (*postea*, p. 35), they were a savage people, unrelated to the tribes of the Andean valleys. Brinton¹ affined the Allentiac with the Millcayac, making them both Aucan (i. e., Araucanian) dialects. Mitre's critical study of Valdivia's grammar and vocabulary of Allentiac, however, seems to make certain the lexical and grammatical independence of this tongue, and to justify the recognition of an *Allentiacan* stock. The Millcayac was probably Puelchean. Boman (p. 36), without sufficient proof, sees in the Huarpes "the last remains of a people, who, much earlier, occupied vast regions of southern South America." The Allentiac and the Millcayac were the chief languages spoken in the old provinces of Mendoza, San Juan, and San Luis. The *Allentiac* was extinct in the 18th century. The principal literature concerning the *Allentiacan* linguistic stock will be found in the following titles:

1. AGUIAR (D. S.). Los Huarpes. Buenos Aires, 1900; 2ª parte, Buenos Aires, 1904.
2. BOMAN (E.). Antiquités de la Région Andine de la République Argentine et du Désert d'Atacama, t. I, Paris, 1908. See pp. 33-37.
3. DE LA GRASSERIE (R.). De la langue Allentiak. Journ. de la Soc. d. Amér. de Paris, 1^{re} s., t. III, 1900, pp. 43 ff.
4. MEDINA (J. T.). See DE VALDIVIA (L.).
5. MITRE (B.). Lenguas Americanas. Estudio bibliográfico-lingüístico de las Obras del P. Luis de Valdivia, sobre el Araucano y el Allentiak, con un vocabulario razonado del Allentiak. La Plata, 1894, pp. 152.

¹ *American Race*, p. 323.

6. MITRE (B.). Catálogo razonado de la Sección Lenguas Americanas. Con una Introducción de Luis María Torres. Tomo I, Buenos Aires, 1909, pp. xliii, 411.
7. DE VALDIVIA (L.). Doctrina Cristiana y Catecismo, con un Confesionario, Arte, y Vocabulario de la lengua Allentiac, por el padre Luis de Valdivia de la Compañía de Jesus. Reimpreso todo á plana y renglon, con una reseña de la vida y obras del autor, por José Toribio Medina. Sevilla, 1894. Reprint of first edition published at Lima in 1607.
8. —. Doctrina Christiana y Cathecismo en la lengua Allentiac que corre en la ciudad de S. Juan de la Frontera, con un Confesionario, Arte y Vocabulario breves. . . . Lima, 1607, pp. 47.
9. —. Arte gramática, vocabulario, catecismo y confesionario en lengua Chilena, y en las lenguas Allentiac y Milcocayac, que son las mas generales de la Provincia de Cuio en el Reino de Chile, y que hablan los Indios Guarpes y otros. . . . Lima, 1908.

The work of Father de Valdivia, the basis of research in the *Allentiacan* language, gives "the Christian doctrine and Catechism in the speech of the Allentiacs of the city of San Juan de la Frontera, with a Confessionary, Grammar, and brief Vocabulary." This linguistic material has been discussed by de la Grasserie and Mitre, the former, in 1894, determining the *Allentiac* to be an independent stock. In 1909, Mitre¹ treats of the *Allentiac* in detail, summarizing (pp. 342-360) the data in de Valdivia as to grammar and morphology, and giving also (pp. 361-409) a vocabulary of Allentiac-Spanish, with etymologies and grammatical analyses where known.

The family name *Allentiacan* comes from *Allentiac* (*Allentiak*), the appellation of the language spoken by the people known likewise by this same term, as well as by the name of *Huarpes*, or *Guarpes*. Both these terms may be of non-Allentiacan origin. Boman (p. 36) suggests a derivation of *Allentiac* from Tehuelche (Tsonekan) *allen*, man, people, and thinks that *Huarpe* may be Aymaran,—but this is conjecture. Mitre,² who makes out *Huarpe* to be Aymaran, follows de Valdivia in the Tsonekan etymology adopted by Boman. The derivation of de Valdivia is not at all satisfactory. Boman also divides *Allentiac* into *Allen-tiak*, and suggests that the Hispanified *Diag-uita* may be cognate. This, again, lacks proof.

¹ *Catálogo*, pp. 339-409.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 346, 347.

II. BOROROAN

The territory of the *Bororoan* stock lies in central Matto Grosso, Brazil. Frič (1906) thus delimits it:

"The Bororó inhabit the entire course of the São Lourenço river as far as its union with the Cuyabá, where they come into contact with the Guató. The northern boundary is formed by the north bank of the Rio das Mortes, the south bank being inhabited by the Cayapós, with whom the Bororó have long waged war. Farther north they occupy both banks of the Araguaya right across the road that leads from Cuyabá to Goyaz."

In the first half of the eighteenth century these Indians roved about the region of the Xingú-Araguaya watershed in central Matto Grosso. Later on, the so-called "Bororó Cabações" settled on the upper Paraguay. The others were for a long time known as "Coroados," and, as Ehrenreich notes, it was only in 1888, as a result of the visit of the second German Xingú expedition, that "the identity of these Indians with the genuine old Bororó was established." Their center was "between the sources of the S. Lourenço and the Cayapó Grande, the principal source of the Araguaya." At the time of von den Steinen's visit there were several hundred Bororó, settled under military supervision, at the colony of Theresa Christina on the São Lourenço. Many Bororó are in the service of the citizens of Cuyabá, and elsewhere. The Matto Grosso Bororó are distinguished as "Bororó da Campanha" (i. e., Bororó of the Plains) and "Bororó Cabações (i. e., Bororó of the river Cabaçal). Von den Steinen in 1894 described the former as "living in small settlements below Villa Maria on the right bank of the Paraguay and Jauru over toward Bolivia," while the latter "live not far from these northward on the banks and headwaters of the Cabaçal and the Jauru, both which rivers flow into the Paraguay from the right, the one at Villa Maria, the other somewhat farther south." The Bororó are termed by von den Steinen "the ruins of a once powerful people, who possessed the country between the Paraguay and the Cuyabá." The Bororó of the São Lourenço are still known as "Coroados." In 1848 the "Bororó da Campanha" were reported as numbering about 180, and the "Bororó Cabações" about 110; and by 1872 the latter had decreased to some 40, while the former were about the same.

(The corresponding numbers for the "Coroados" were not given.) Conflicts with the whites (1875-1880, and since) have further seriously reduced the number of these Indians.

In 1891, Brinton¹ classed the Bororós simply as a tribe of the Tupian stock, although the independent character of their language had been noted by von den Steinen some years before. In 1892, de la Viñaza, in his bibliographical monograph (p. 341) stated that "la lengua Bororó es de origen desconocido." In 1894, von den Steinen, in his work on the aborigines of central Brazil (p. 517), expressly stated that the language of the Bororó is unrelated to any other.

The chief literature concerning the *Bororoan* linguistic stock will be found in the following titles:

1. BOGGIANI (G.). Etnografía del Alto Paraguay. Bol. Inst. Geogr. Argent. (B. Aires), 1898, vol. XVIII, pp. 613-626, map.
2. —. Vocabulario. MS. Printed in the article of Frič and Radin (q. v.).
3. CALDAS (—). Vocabulario do lingua indígena dos Bororós Coroados. Cuyabá, 1899.
4. CARDÚS (J.). Las Misiones Franciscanas entre los Infeles de Bolivia, etc. Barcelona, 1886, pp. 425.
5. DE CASTELNAU (F.). Voyage dans les parties centrales de l'Amérique du Sud. . . . Histoire du voyage. 6 vols. Paris, 1850-51. See vol. v.
6. EHRENREICH (P.). Anthropologische Studien über die Urbewohner Brasiliens. Braunschweig, 1897, pp. iv, 168.
7. FRIČ (V.) and RADIN (F.). Contributions to the Study of the Bororo Indians. Journ. Anthropol. Inst. (Lond.), vol. XXXVI, 1906, pp. 393-406.
8. KOSLOWSKY (J.). Algunos datos sobre los indios Bororós. Rev. d. Mus. de La Plata, tomo VI, 1895, pp. 373-410.
9. —. Tres semanas entre los indios Guatós. Ibid., tomo VI, 1895, pp. 221-250.
10. MELGAÇO (*Baron*). See VON DEN STEINEN (K.).
11. VON MARTIUS (C. F. P.). Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerika's zumal Brasiliens. 2 Bde., Leipzig, 1867. Bd. II: Wörtersammlung brasilianischer Sprachen, pp. xxi, 548.
12. MEYER (H.). Bogen und Pfeil in Central-Brasilien. Leipzig, 1896. Translated: Bows and Arrows in Central Brazil, in Rep. Smithsonian Inst., Washington, 1896.
13. MONTINHO (J. F.). Notícia sobre a provincia de Matto Grosso. S. Paulo, 1869.

¹ *American Race*, p. 23.

14. VON DEN STEINEN (K.). *Durch Central-Brasilien*. Leipzig, 1886, pp. xii, 372.

15. —. *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens*. Berlin, 1894, pp. xiv, 570.

Montinho (pp. 170-171) gives some words of the "Bororós-Cabaças," and also a vocabulary of 32 words (pp. 192-194) of the "Coroados," but these latter belong not to the Bororó thus named, having been, as von den Steinen points out, taken from von Martius' work. They are really "Coroado of the Rio Xipoto," and altogether non-Bororó. The identity of the Matto Grosso "Coroados" with the Bororó was suspected by Melgaço and Cazal before von den Steinen's demonstration of it. Boggiani's vocabulary in Frič and Radin contains about 150 words, of which some are not to be found in Caldas or von den Steinen. In his work on *The Aborigines of Central Brazil* (pp. 441-518) von den Steinen furnishes an excellent ethnological sketch of the Bororó. Besides the few grammatical notes there given (p. 17), he also prints a German-Bororó vocabulary of some 300 words. Brief vocabularies are given in von Martius¹ and in Cardús, the former taken from de Castelnau.²

The family name, *Bororoan*, is derived from *Bororó* (Bororós), the term by which these Indians have long been known. Its etymology is uncertain.

III. CALCHAQUIAN

The character of the *Calchaquian* language and the extent of the territory occupied by those who once spoke it have been the subject of much discussion and even disputation. In 1891, Brinton (*Amer. Race*, pp. 319-320) recognized a "Catamareña" stock, to which he assigned the following tribes—*Acalianes*, *Cacas* (or *Cacanas*), *Calchaquis*, *Catamarcas*, *Diagitas* (or *Diachitas*), *Quilmes*, *Tamanos*. He identified the *Calchaquian* language with the *Catamareño* or *Cacana* tongue, a grammar of which was written by de Barcena, but suggested that further research might show that the Calchaquis "were a branch of the Araucanians." The *Calchaquian* culture, he thought, had been inspired by the Peruvian. Later,³

¹ Vol. II, pp. 14-15.

² Vol. V, p. 285.

³ *Stud. in S. Amer. Nat. Langs.*, 1892, pp. 52-58.

he looked upon the *Calchaquis* as "a more or less mixed branch of the Kechua family," abandoning his former recognition of the language as an independent stock. This "identification of the *Calchaqui* dialect of Tucuman with a patois of the Kechua," is based by him partly on the fact that the Abbé Camaño speaks of a "*Calchaqui* or *Tucumano* or *Catamareño* dialect of Quechua." But it is admitted that the people of the *Calchaqui* country had abandoned their mother tongue (if they had one) for Quechua before the time of Camaño, so his evidence is hardly convincing. Von Tschudi's attempt to connect the *Calchaquian* language with Atacameñan, Ameghino's claim of Aymaran relationship, Lafone-Quevedo's view that it was a mixed or mongrel tongue (Kechuan-Abiponian-Guarani), etc., are all without sufficient proof. H. von Ihering holds to the theory of an independent stock as Brinton did formerly.

The importance of the ancient *Calchaquian* culture has recently been emphasized by Ambrosetti, Boman, and other investigators. Ambrosetti (1902, 1903) believes the territory of the *Calchaquian* independent stock to have included a good deal of the Argentine provinces of Jujuy, Salta, Tucuman, and Catamarca, with extensions farther south in La Rioja and San Juan, even to the borders of Mendoza. He thinks that the Inca element in *Calchaquian* culture has been exaggerated, and the native factor underestimated. He has also made out an interesting comparison between the *Calchaquian* culture and that of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Arizona, but this does not necessarily imply any close racial or linguistic relationship of these two peoples—it merely emphasizes the effects of very similar natural environments upon the development of human civilization.

Léjeal and Boman (1906), in their discussion of the "*Calchaqui* question," identify *Calchaqui* culture with Diaguitan culture, holding that "the *Calchaquis* were not themselves a distinct nation, but belonged to the more important Diaguitan people, whose territory extended over all the Andine region of northern Argentina, from the peak of Acay and the valley of Lerma, on the north, to the province of San Juan on the south (the Sierra de Córdoba

excepted).” While recognizing the Peruvian element in Diaguitan culture, and that a very large one, these authors (p. 186) allow a considerable factor of independent origin. Later, Boman¹ discusses in detail the Diaguitas and their culture. He attributes to them, at the time of the Spanish conquest, all the mountainous region of modern Argentina, from the Nevado of Acay and the valley of Lerma, on the north, probably to the province of Mendoza, on the south; in this region must, however, be excepted the Sierra de Córdoba, inhabited by the Comechingones, whose culture, like that of the Diaguitas, seems to have had affinities with the Andine type, but who did not speak Cacan, the general language of the Diaguitas” (p. 12). Also, “the Diaguitas constituted an ethnic unity, not only from the point of view of their culture, but likewise linguistically; they all spoke a common language, the Cacan, Caca, or Kakan” (p. 16). Boman’s map shows the extent of the *Calchaquian* or Diaguitan territory as above described.

In his later discussion of the subject Brinton² states that the *Calchaqui* or *Cacana* language “was merely a corrupt dialect of the widely extended Quechua stock,” but admits that “it is possible that at the conquest some relics of an earlier tongue remained.” Ehrenreich (1905) inclined to the opinion that the *Calchaquis* were a mixed people, as Lafone-Quevedo maintained. Taking all things into consideration, however, there still seems reason to believe in the independent character linguistically of the people in question, and they are here ranked as such—the *Calchaquian* linguistic stock, that term being preferred over *Catamareñan*, *Cacan*, *Cacanan*, or *Diaguitan*. At its greatest extent, the *Calchaquian* stock may be said to have occupied a territory of varying breadth, between about 23° 30' and 32° 30' S. lat. The *Calchaquian* language was still spoken in the seventeenth century; and Boman (p. 20) observes: “Lozano informs us that the Jesuit Hernando de Torreblanca was, in 1657, the only Spaniard who knew the language of the *Calchaquis*.” Outes and Bruch (pp. 48–65) recognize the independent character of the *Caca* tongue, but reject the term *Calchaqui* as improperly applied to the Diaguitas.

¹ *Antiq. d. Rég. And.*, t. I, 1908, pp. 12–32, etc.

² *Ling. Cartog. Chaco Reg.*, 1898, p. 27.

The chief literature concerning the *Calchaquian* linguistic stock will be found in the following titles:

1. AMBROSETTI (J. B.). La civilisation Calchaqui. Congr. Intern. d. Amér., XIIe sess. (Paris, 1900), 1902, pp. 293-297.
2. ——. Ressemblance entre les civilisations Pueblo et Calchaqui. Ibid., XIIIe sess. (N. Y., 1902), 1906, pp. 9-15.
3. ——. Antiguëdades Calchaquies, Buenos Aires, 1902, pp. 97, repr. from vols. LIII and LIV of *Anales de la Sociedad Científica Argentina*.
4. ——. I Calchaqui, Roma, 1903, pp. 18, repr. from the *Bollettino della Società Geografica Italiana*.
5. DE BARZANA (A.). The existence of works attributed to this writer is doubted by Boman (pp. 17-20), but Brinton (*Amer. Race*, p. 320) says a grammar of Cacana was written and perhaps published by him.
6. BOGGIANI (C.). Cartografía lingüística del Chaco, por el Dr Brinton. Rev. del Inst. Parag. (Asunción), 1899, pp. 106-137.
7. BOMAN (E.). Antiquités de la Région Andine de la République Argentine et du Désert d'Atacama. Tome I, Paris, 1908, pp. xi, 388. See pp. 12-32 on Diaguitas.
8. BRINTON (D. G.). The American Race. New York, 1891, pp. xvi, 392.
9. ——. Studies in the Native Languages of South America. Philadelphia, 1892, pp. 67.
10. ——. The Linguistic Cartography of the Chaco Region. Philadelphia, 1898, pp. 30.
11. CAMAÑO (ABBÉ). Elementi della lingua Quichua. Ms. (18th cent.). Cited by Brinton (*Studies*, p. 52).
12. LAFONE-QUEVEDO (S. A.). Tesoro de Catamarqueñismos: Nombres de lugar y apellidos indios con etimologías y eslabones aislados de la lengua Cacana. Buenos Aires, 1898, pp. xlv, 377. Also in *Anales de la Sociedad Científica Argentina*, vols. XXXIX-XLI, 1895-1898.
13. LÉJEAL (L.) et BOMAN (E.). La question Calchaquie. Congr. Intern. d. Amér., XVe sess. (Québec, 1906), 1907, pp. 179-186.
14. LOZANO (P.). Historia de la conquista del Paraguay, Rio de La Plata, Tucuman (1745). Edición Lamas. Buenos Aires, 1873-1875.
15. MORENO (F. P.). Exploración arqueológica de la provincia de Catamarca. Rev. del Mus. de La Plata (La Plata), vol. 1, 1891, pp. 199-216.
16. MOSSI (M. A.). Gramática razonada de la lengua Quichua, comparada con las lenguas del antiguo continente; con notas especiales sobre la que se habla en Santiago del Estero y Catamarca. Córdoba, 1889.
17. NARVAEZ (P. S.). Relación de las provincias de Tucuman (1583?). Madrid, 1885.
18. OUTES (F. F.) y BRUCH (C.). Los Aborígenes de la República Argentina. Buenos Aires, 1910, pp. 149.
19. QUESADA (V. G.). Apuntes sobre el Orígen de la lengua Quechua en Santiago del Estero. In his *Estudios Históricos* (Buenos Aires, 1863).

20. QUIROGA (A.). Antigüedades calchaquíes. Bol. del Inst. Geogr. Argent. (B. Aires), vol. xvii, 1896, pp. 177 ff.
21. —. Folk-lore Calchaquí. Ibid., vol. xviii, 1897, pp. 48 ff.
22. SOPRANO (P. P.). Historia de las Guerras con los terribles Calchaquíes, Chiriguano, y los Quilmes. Completa conquista del antiguo Tucuman. Buenos Aires, 1896.
23. DEL TECHO (N.). Historia Provinciæ Paraguariæ . . . Leodii, 1673.

Whatever vocabularies, texts, etc., in the *Calchaquian* language may have been collected by the old missionaries, they are now lost or inaccessible, lying, perhaps, in unknown locations. The linguistic data remaining consist of place-names, etc., and these are discussed by Lafone-Quevedo, in his *Tesoro de Catamaqueñismos*, but not to the satisfaction of Brinton (*Ling. Cart.*, p. 26), who cites from him some of these words and terminations. Brinton cites a *Grammar of Calchaqui* as having been written (and published?) by the Jesuit missionary Alonso de Barcena (or Barzana), and other authorities cite a *Vocabulary* as well; but Boman (pp. 17–20) finds no such works in existence; careful investigation, e. g., showing that the *Vocabulario* stated by Graesse to be in Paris does not exist there at all (this was said to have been printed at Los Reyes in 1586). The *Lexicon et præcepta grammatica*, for which a date, “Peruviæ, 1590,” is assigned by several bibliographers, is, according to Boman, a “made-up” title.

The family name, *Calchaquian*, comes from *Calchaqui*, the appellation of the most celebrated member of the stock, best known through its stubborn resistance to the conquering Spaniards. Its etymology is unknown. The language seems to have been called *Caca*, *Cacana*, etc.

CLARK UNIVERSITY
WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS